

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 11, and 23 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-29 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628 (hereinafter “Anuff”). Claims 5, 15, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,673 (hereinafter “Maslov”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Anuff.

Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff fails to disclose or suggest the manner in which the software code that creates portlets is constructed as recited in the claims. As discussed previously, a portlet is a web-based page or window that displays data from a data source. (Application: Paragraph [0021]). Thus, a portlet as recited in the claims may be considered analogous to the GUIs created by the modules disclosed in Anuff.

Using embodiments of the present invention, a user does not have to write software code for the modules that create the GUIs of Anuff. In Anuff, the user can specify a content source and layout for the content in the GUIs created by the modules. However, each of the modules themselves are pre-created in Anuff. Anuff does not disclose or suggest that the modules themselves are created as recited in the claims.

For example, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “generating software coding using the computer system that creates a portlet based on the data source specification and the layout specification, the portlet configured to create a visual representation within the portal page

of data specified by the data source specification according to the layout specification.” Thus, Anuff does not disclose the modules themselves are declaratively specified by a user based on the access information and the data specification as recited in amended claim 1. Anuff merely discloses that the user can adjust the GUI or display by specifying the content source and layout.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff fails to disclose generating a set of graphical user interfaces using a computer system that enable users to interactively construct software code that creates or otherwise generates portlets configured to generate displays on a portal page as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

In another example, amended claim 11 recites generating software coding that creates an object. The object as recited in amended claim 11 creates a graphical user interface displaying retrieved data according to a layout provided by a user based on a declarative specification for a data source and a layout specification. As recited, a set of graphical user interfaces is generated that enable users to interactively construct software code that creates portlets configured to generate displays on a portal page. As discussed above, while Anuff discloses that a use can customize the GUIs of the modules, Anuff fails to provide disclose that the modules are created or otherwise generated as recited in amended claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11 and 23 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-10, 12-21, and 23-29 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 11, and 23 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the remaining rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application.

Appl. No. 10/676,829
Amdt. dated March 2, 2009
Reply to Office Action of September 30, 2008

PATENT

Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
61828810 v1